

UNITED STATES LEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBE	R FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
06/33/9042 12/	16/81 JOE	C C	X-50266

JOSEF# A. JONES ELI LILLY & CO., PATENT DIVISION 30% EAST MC CARTY STREET INDIANAFOLIS, IN 46285

APER NUMBER
3

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined.	to communication filed on	This action is made final
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is se Failure to respond within the period for response will cause to		= days from the date of this letter. 35 U.S.C. 133
Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PAR		
1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-89	2. Notice of Informal Pat	ent Drawing, PTO-948
3. Notice of References Cited by Applicant, PTO-14	449 4. Notice of Informal Pal	tent Application, Form PTO-152
Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION 5		
1. Claims 1-62		are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims		are withdrawn from consideration
2. Claims		have been cancelled.
3. Claims		
4. V Claims 1-8,11,12,14, 1 5. V Claims 9,10,13,15,	7-62	are rejected.
5. Claims 9, 10, 13, 15,	16	are objected to.
6. Claims	are sub	ject to restriction or election requirement
7. The formal drawings filled on	are acc	aptable.
8. The drawing correction request filed on	has bee	n approved. disapproved.
9. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority	under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has	
been received.	been filed in parent application, serial no.	,
	filed on	_ ·
 Since this application appears to be in condition for cordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 		cution as to the merits is closed in ac-

PTOL-326 (rev. 7-79)

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Serial No. 331042 Art Unit 121

Claims 1-8, 11, 12, 14 and 17-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Jones et al, reference AB (Jones). Although, the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of Title 35 U.S.C., the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Jones generically discloses applicant's invention at column 2 and specifically discloses the pyrrolidino analog at column 39. Applicant alludes to biological testing of the instant compounds in his disclosure statement. The testing disclosed in the specification does not appear to involve a direct side-by-side comparison with the Jones pyrrolidino compound. Such a comparison is necessary to rebut the strong presumption of obviousness which the reference establishes.

Claims 48-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his or her invention.

Serial No. 331042 Art Unit 121

3

The claims are improper composition claims, since they do not recite either an intended use in the preamble or a carrier or diluent.

Claims 9, 10, 13, 15 and 16 contain allowable subject matter but are objected to as depending from a rejected base claim. If rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim(s) from which they depend, they would be considered allowable.

Schwartz:ajr

A/C 703

557-2517

7-2-82

RICHARD A. SCHWARTZ PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 121